

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/649,092	KARAIWA, MASATO	
	Examiner Monique R Jackson	Art Unit 1773	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Monique R Jackson. (3) _____.

(2) Roger Hahn. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 9/10/03 & 11/10/03.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-6.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hamada & Itoh.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: No agreement in terms of patentability was reached. A discussion took place regarding the finality of the prior office action wherein the Applicant's attorney argued that the amendment filed 6/2/03 did not necessitate the new grounds of rejection given that the amendments resulted from 112 issues only.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required